APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,377	06/28/2000	Puneet Agarwal	P4501	5997

24739   7590   06/13/2003

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY
PO BOX 187
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER
DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/606,377	AGARWAL ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Oanh L. Duong	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chao et al (Chao) (US 6,338,092 B1) in view of Goertzel et al (Goertzel) (US 6,208,952

B1).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, Chao teaches in a distributed processor

system wherein each of the first plurality of processors maintains a copy of the

database (see abstract), a method for synchronized maintenance and distribution of the

database (see col. 3 lines 22-23) comprising sharing the generated or amended data

from the servers to the clients, such that each of the first plurality of processors receives

generated and amended data (see col. 5 lines 3-47). Chao does not a processor

running the first and second protocols. However, Goertzel teaches registering each of

the first plurality of processors with at least one other of the first plurality of processors,

creating client-server pairs (see fig. 3), in an arrangement that each of plurality of

processors either run or is registered with a processor running the first and second

protocols (see col. 1 lines 59-62 and col. 4 line 36-col. 5 line 20). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to have utilized multiple protocols in Chao as taught by Goertzel

because such protocols enable processors (e.g. client or server) in a computer systems

to communicate with a wide ranges of other processors on other computer systems.

Regarding claims 2, 8, 14 and 20, Chao teaches registering each of the second

plurality of processors with at least one of the first plurality of processors, creating client-

server pairs between individual one of the first and second plurality of processor and

sharing at least a subset of the database from the servers in the first plurality of

processors to the clients in the second plurality of processors (see col. 10 lines 57-67).

Regarding claims 3, 9, 15 and 21, Chao teaches registering each of a third

plurality of processors with individual ones of the second plurality of processors,

creating client-server pairs between individual ones of the second and the third plurality

of processors, enabling clients in the third plurality of processors to receive copies of the

subset of the database (see col. 10 lines 57-67).

Regarding claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, Chao teaches clients register with a second

processor to create a redundant server-client relationship for fault tolerance (see fig. 3

col. 4 lines 13-17).

Regarding claims 5, 11, 17 and 23, Chao teaches communicates only with the

primary server as long as the primary server remains capable, and further comprising a

step of activating the secondary server in the event the primary server fails (see col. 7

lines 4-19).

2.   Claims 6, 12, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chao et al (Chao) (US 6,338,092 B1) in view of Goertzel et al

(Goertzel) (US 6,208,952 B1) in further view of Gehami et al (Gehami) (US 5,765,171).

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18 and 24, the combination of teachings of Chao and

Goetzel does not teach determines the difference and used only the difference in further

propagation of copes. However, Gehami teaches upon activation of the second server,

a copy of the database is sent to the client which compares that copy with its own copy,

determines the difference, and uses only the difference in further propagation of copies

(see col. 2 lines 19-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to have utilized the

comparing step in the combination of teachings of Chao and Goerzel as taught by

Gehami because such comparing step enables the client to copy only data items from

the server which have added or changed so as to reduce the processing time.

Conclusion

3.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239

for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

O.D
June 5, 2003

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100